



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/672,656

09/26/2003

Lawrence Allen Rigge

7

8206

47386 7590 03/19/2008

RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
1300 POST ROAD
SUITE 205
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

DOAN, KIET M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/672,656	Applicant(s) RIGGE, LAWRENCE ALLEN	
	Examiner KIET DOAN	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is response to Remarks file on 01/02/2008.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 01/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument in claim 1 that reference does not disclose or suggestion "second integrated circuit is a monitoring station".

Examiner respectfully disagrees and maintains that Richman teaches "transmitting a wireless signal from said integrated circuit device to said monitoring station using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device" (Paragraphs [0006], [0012], Fig.2, Illustrate IC device 101 transceiver wireless signal 140 to IC device 102 wherein the IC device 102 as read on "monitoring station", in Richman, the IC device (101, 102) are located in the enclosure 150 wherein the housing is self-contained device such as computer, digital television or Original Equipment Manufacture (OEM), the exchange.

Therefore, examiner interpreted "Monitoring station" using the broadest reasonable interpretation and hence Richman read on the limitations of claims 1 and 25.

In response to applicant's and requesting withdrawal of the Section 102 rejection,

Examiner respectfully disagrees, and maintains that the Richman reference was filed on 06/24/2003 and the present Application was filed on 09/26/2003. The Office

also acknowledges that Richman and the present application are assigned to Agere System Inc. However, the Richman reference was filed more than three months prior to the present application. Therefore, Richman qualify as prior art under Section 102 (e) applied in the previous rejection.

Therefore, examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 25 using the Richman reference, these rejections are made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richman (US 2004/0266363 A1).

Consider **claims 1 and 25**. Richman teaches a method for wireless communication between an integrated circuit device and a monitoring station, said method comprising the steps of:

transmitting a wireless signal from said integrated circuit device to said monitoring station using an antenna associated with said integrated circuit device (Paragraphs[0006], [0012], Fig.2, Illustrate IC device 101 transmitting wireless signal 140 to IC device 102 using antenna 110-12, wherein the IC device as read on

Art Unit: 2617

monitoring station); wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device (see claim 3 teach antenna is a pin) .

Consider **claim 2**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said antenna is incorporated in said integrated circuit device (see claim 2).

Consider **claim 4**. Richman teaches the method of claim 2, wherein at antenna is printed on said integrated circuit device (see claim 4).

Consider **claim 5**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11 wireless standard (see claim 11).

Consider **claim 6**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard (see claim 12).

Consider **claim 7**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with a Bluetooth standard (see claim 13).

Consider **claim 8**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is testing said integrated circuit device (Paragraph [0012]).

Consider **claim 9**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is debugging said integrated circuit device (Paragraph [0012-0013]).

Consider **claim 10**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is evaluating said integrated circuit device (Paragraph [0012-0013]).

Consider **claim 11**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a test command (Paragraphs [0014-0015]).

Consider **claim 12**. Richman teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device (Paragraphs [0014-0015]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 13-14, 16-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt (US 2002/0196029 A1) in view of Cheung et al. (US 6,577,157 B1).

Consider **claim 13**. Schmidt teaches an integrated circuit device, comprising:

at least one circuit (16 of 10A); and

an antenna for wireless device communication with an external monitoring station (Abstract, Paragraphs [0017], [0021-0022], (Fig.1, Illustrates and teaches wireless device 10 (a-b) communicates with tester 20 wherein the tester read on external monitoring station). Schmidt teaches all the limitations of claim as discussed above, **but is silent on**, wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device.

In an analogous art, Cheung teaches “Fully programmable I/O with memory”. Further, **Cheung teaches** wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device (C2, L50-62, C5, L44-49 teach programmable pin operated as signal pin and act as antenna).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time that the invention was made that person having ordinary skill in the art to modify Schmidt and Cheung system, such that an antenna for wireless device communication with an external monitoring station, and wherein said antenna is a pin on said integrated circuit device to provide means for the flexible and reduce noise when integrated circuit is a pin for transmitting signal.

Consider **claim 14**. Cheung teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said antenna is incorporated in said integrated circuit device (C3, L63-65).

Consider **claim 16**. Cheung teaches the method of claim 2, wherein at antenna is printed on said integrated circuit device (C1, L45-50, C2, L63-65 teach the programmable pin including pad wherein the pad act as input/out put).

Consider **claim 17**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an 802.11 wireless standard (Paragraph [0017] [0041]).

Consider **claim 18**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with an ultra wide band wireless standard (Paragraph [0042]).

Consider **claim 19**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is transmitted in accordance with a Bluetooth standard (Paragraph [0017-0018]).

Consider **claim 20**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is testing said integrated circuit device (Paragraph [0021-0022]).

Consider **claim 21**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is debugging said integrated circuit device (Paragraphs [0022], [0025]).

Consider **claim 22**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said monitoring station is evaluating said integrated circuit device (Paragraph [0018]).

Consider **claim 23**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a test command (Paragraphs [0021]).

Consider **claim 24**. Schmidt teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said signal is a memory pattern to be applied to a memory area on said integrated circuit device (Paragraphs [0017], [0021]).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIET DOAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7863. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Appiah N. Charles can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kiet Doan/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617